

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action of September 27, 2007. This request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC 112

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as his invention. The Examiner suggested that Claims 10 and 11 recite the limitation of, "the predetermined P" and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in both Claims 4 and 5. In consideration of the Examiner's suggestions, Claim 10 was canceled and the rejected portion of Claim 11 was amended to read "a predetermined P", and therefore the rejection under 35 USC 112 should be removed.

### AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 were canceled for the better presentation of the present invention. Claim 3 was amended to spell out the depended portion (the canceled claim 1) to make the amended Claim 3 independent. No new matter has been added. Claim 5 was amended to change the dependency due to the cancellation of Claim 2. No new matter has been added.

### DISCUSSION REGARDING THE EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

In this office action, Examiner rejected this application once again by stating that the Applicant's argument was not persuasive. More precisely, Examiner stated that Uchida discloses (*col. 3, line 29+; col. 4, lines 18+; col. 5, lines 18+ and FIGS. 1-14*): a battery charging apparatus (1) connected to a network management apparatus (2) which includes: a CPU (21), which is a part of the electric unit (70); and a battery information reading unit (28), a display unit (16), and an output battery information reading unit (34). Examiner suggested that the above-elements are interpreted as Applicant's measurement display unit which measures deterioration and charging level of the rapid charge battery.

Examiner further states that Uchida (*col. 5, lines 1-16 and FIGS. 1 & 6-9*) the battery charging unit (1) that the electric device (70) with CPU (21), ROM (22), a RAM (23), a MODEM (24), a network control unit (25), a card access unit (26), a battery detecting unit (27), a battery information unit (28), an energy discharging unit (35), a shutter drive unit (29), a door drive unit (30), a battery charging unit (31), a timer (32) for counting a clock, a solenoid drive unit (33) for driving the stoppers (49), and display unit (16), and an output battery information reading unit (34).

Examiner suggested that the above-elements are coupled to each other by system bus (19), and therefore although the display unit (16) and the information reading unit (28), and the output battery information reading unit (34), the function of notifying the deterioration of the battery could be performed by the controller (20) through communication via the system bus (19).

As Examiner suggested, the battery charging apparatus of Uchida mainly comprises the CPU (21), the battery detecting unit (28), the display unit (16), and the output battery information reading unit (34). However, the functions and roles of the main elements above are different from the present invention.

Uchida mainly discloses the device comprising the battery detecting unit (28), the output battery information reading unit (34), the charging unit (31), the output battery information reading unit (34), and the display unit (16). The battery detecting unit (28) of Uchida is for detecting battery insertion (see Col. 4, line 23). The user immediately receives the charged battery stored in the battery storage (51) of the same type as the battery inserted. The inserted battery may then be charged and provided to the subsequent user. The controller (20) then recognizes the charged battery ID by the outputting battery reading unit (34) (see Col. 7, lines 25-41). It seems that Uchida collect the information about the inserted battery, not the output battery, for the purpose of judging whether to be recharged for the next user or discharged to make use of any residual energy in the battery for safety reasons. Apparently, in the Uchida system, the inserted battery is not for a quick turnaround but for the next user, and therefore, there is no reason for Uchida to indicate the condition of the inserted battery to the immediate user. This leads to the purpose of having the display unit (16), which shows an error message if the inserted battery is registered or not.

The present invention is the charging system for the rapid charge battery. This system will give a fast and quick access to the recharged battery for the immediate user, not for the next user. It would be important to the immediate user to know about the condition of the battery to be recharged as the inserted battery is reused by that user. Therefore, the feature of Claim 3 is a function to notify the user via the charging processor when the deterioration of the rapid charge battery goes below the predetermined level. Paragraph [0031] of the present specification described the notification process where it states "if the deterioration is below the predetermined level, the control unit (22) will notify the measurement display unit (12) as to the degree of deterioration to further notify the user. Alternatively, the control unit 22 can transmit a trigger signal to the charger (11) so as to stop the charging. As such, controlling of the battery charging can be centralized. Therefore, the member may feel more secure about the system; allows easy access of the existing battery problems to the service provider and this helps to improve battery

technology.”

Uchida does not disclose, teach or suggest the charging system as appeared in the present invention, which is for the immediate recharging system for the immediate user, and the function of notifying the deterioration of the battery to the user for the above-specified purpose. Therefore, the differences described above should be sufficient to remove the Examiner’s rejection using Uchida.

#### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are now in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

/Tracy M Heims/

Tracy M Heims

Apex Juris, pllc  
12360 Lake City Way Northeast, Suite 410  
Seattle, Washington 98125  
Phone: 206-664-0314  
Fax: 206-664-0329  
Email: usa@apexjuris.com